Pages 1 - 53

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Jacqueline S. Corley, Magistrate Judge

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER)
PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION.) NO. 18-MD-02843 VC (JSC)

San Francisco, California Wednesday, December 9, 2020

TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM WEBINAR PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM:

For Plaintiffs:

KELLER ROHRBACK LLP

1201 Third Avenue - Suite 3200

Seattle, Washington 98101

BY: DEREK LOESER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

CARI LAUFENBERG, ATTORNEY AT LAW

DAVID J. KO, ATTORNEY AT LAW

BLEICHMAR, FONTI & AULD LLP 555 12th Street - Suite 1600 Oakland, California 94607

BY: LESLEY E. WEAVER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

ANNE K. DAVIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

MATTHEW P. MONTGOMERY, ATTORNEY AT LAW ANGELICA M. ORNELAS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

Reported By: Marla F. Knox, RPR, CRR, RMR

United States Official Court Reporter

seek valuation documents about very particular types of valuations.

They are asking about documents how Facebook values individual pieces of user data; how Facebook values the named Plaintiffs' data.

What we have been telling Plaintiffs -- and we have investigated this extensively -- is that Facebook simply doesn't value information that way. So to the best of our knowledge there wouldn't be responsive materials.

The other issue here is that the RFPs ask for documents sufficient to show this type of information.

So we are running the search strings because typically when you don't think there are documents about something specific and you are asking for documents specific -- sufficient to show that information, you run search strings. So you figure out if they are there.

And that's what we are trying to do; run the search strings. Figure out if there are any documents that show the extensive valuation. We don't think there are.

From our perspective, we think the first step here is to run the search strings. See if they return anything seeking the type of information Plaintiffs are seeking, and then we can take it from there.

The other issue we are having is that after Plaintiffs sought that type of information, they did send us the letter

Okay.

MS. WEAVER: Yep.

THE COURT: So the next issue is the named Plaintiffs' data. And here I actually am kind of confused because Facebook suggested that there may not be any data other than what they have already produced. And then I don't understand why (video freeze interruption.)

MS. KUTSCHER CLARK: Right, Your Honor.

So, as we noted in our submission, we learned for the first time in Plaintiffs' sur-reply brief on the named Plaintiffs' data that what they are really seeking is only data about the named Plaintiffs that was shared with third parties.

And for us seeing that in the sur-reply brief was a really big aha moment because we had spent literally hundreds of hours meeting and conferring about data that is never shared outside of Facebook.

So now that we understand what they are really seeking is the type of data that is actually shared or made accessible to third parties, we have been taking a much closer look at what would be responsive to that. And as we currently understand, what has been produced really does cover that universe.

But we obviously want to be a hundred percent sure that that is correct, and we are talking about a 13-year period, so it is a very long time.

So we have been conducting a very careful investigation

within the company to be a hundred percent sure that the materials produced to date reflect the full scope of any data that could have been shared or made accessible to third parties about the named Plaintiffs since 2007.

And if we do come across anything additional, we will obviously report that to Plaintiffs and discuss a production format with them, but to date we have not come across anything that has not been produced already that could have even potentially been shared with third parties.

MR. LOESER: Your Honor, if I may, I think there will probably be multiple comments in response to that statement.

That makes no sense to us at all.

First of all, the question of their brief, which they quote in their statement, talks about information, in fact, shared. And what our brief said in our reply was information shared or made accessible.

And we were very careful to use that language, "made accessible," because Facebook has said for a long time that it doesn't keep records of what it actually shares, which seemed hard to believe to us.

But in order to avoid a semantic game, we also included the reference to "made accessible" because whether it was shared, whether they have records of it, if it was put in a place or utilized in a way where third parties had access to it, that substantially expands the universe of potential